Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	10/604,748	MANTONE ET	MANTONE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit		
	Tiffany A. Fetzner	2859		
All Participants:	Status of Application: <u>N</u>	Status of Application: No reply to Office action		
(1) Ex. Tiffany A. Fetzner.	(3)			
(2) Attorney Joseph Heino Reg. No. 31,524.	(4)			
Date of Interview: 14 February 2006	Time: <u>3:31pm</u>			
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Ap Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:	plicant's representative)			
Part I.				
Rejection(s) discussed: None				
Claims discussed: None			·	
Prior art documents discussed: None				
Part II.				
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED: See Continuation Sheet				
Part III.				
 ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separ-directly resulted in the allowance of the application of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. ☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separ-did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief sum 	. The examiner will provide a wr ate record of the substance of the	itten summary of t ne interview, since	he substance	
Ex. Tillay A. Feterer AU 2859 571-272-2241				
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (Appl	icant/Applicant's Representative	Signature – if app	ropriate)	
(, (pp)		3	, ,	

Application No.

Applicant(s)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The Examiner spoke to applicant's representative Attorney Joseph Heino Reg. No. 31,524 on Feb. 14th 2006 to confirm the status of the instant application, and he responded that no reply 10 the Aug. 10th 2005 Office action has been filed and that the case is currently ABANDONED.